

The Baruch Plan for World Government

Peter Myers, September 5, 2001; update April 8, 2010.

My comments are shown {thus}.

Write to me at contact.html.

You are at <http://mailstar.net/baruch-plan.html>.

In 1946, the US government put to Stalin a plan for World Government, created by Bernard Baruch & David Lilienthal, both Jews. This plan was put in the pages of *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* Bertrand Russell described its development in his book *Has Man a Future?* russell2.html. Baruch had earlier been associated with Wilson's attempt to have the League of Nations created as a World Government, with a World Army and a World Court: c20-doc.html. The *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (Jerusalem, 1971) says that Baruch "served on the Supreme Economic Council at the Conference of Versailles, where he was President Wilson's personal economic adviser".

Stalin got cold feet - he'd noticed the Jewish campaign to have a Jewish republic within the USSR, created in the Crimea: sudoplat.html. What unnerved him especially was that AMERICAN Jews, with their huge financial power, would be involved, and he felt that the USSR would lose control.

As a result, some leaders of the Jewish Antifascist Committee (American at that) had their lives shortened.

- (1) Overview
- (2) The Baruch Plan - from *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*
- (3) Anglo-American support for the Baruch Plan - Bertrand Russell, H. G. Wells, Arnold Toynbee
- (4) Jewish support for the Baruch Plan
- (5) Major Jordan, Atomic Shipments to USSR, Baruch Plan, & Convergence to World Government - a discussion with Phil Eversoul
- (6) Lord Victor Rothschild's involvement with the Peace Movement and Israel's Nuclear Bomb

(1) Overview

The proposal was put in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* over several months in 1946. In his book *Has Man a Future?*, Bertrand Russell - an advocate of World Government - describes how it developed, first as a proposal assembled by David Lilienthal, then in a form developed by Bernard Baruch (p. 25 & p. 97).

This "Baruch Plan" was canvassed in the issues of 1946 and put to Stalin. By the end of that year, Stalin had rejected it, on the grounds that it required submission to Washington, and the Cold War had begun.

The One World conspiracy has three factions: Tory (Imperial), International Socialist, and Zionist: british-conspiracy.html.

The Baruch Plan cannot be deemed a "Tory" document, because otherwise Jewish Communists like Einstein would not have supported it.

Baruch and Lilienthal were Jewish. One might place Baruch in the Zionist faction, because he headed the Jewish delegation obtaining Palestine at the Paris Peace Conference in 1919: freedman.html.

But the high-profile Jewish backers of the Baruch Plan (**all of the following scientists, plus Lippmann, are Jewish**: Albert Einstein, Robert Oppenheimer, Leo Szilard, Walter Lippmann, Niels Bohr, James Franck,

Eugene Rabinowitch, Hy Goldsmith, Hans Bethe, Harold Urey) belong to the International Socialist faction.

So here one sees the joining of the Trotskyist and Zionist forces.

The International Socialist faction is also what H. G. Wells called the "Open Conspiracy" for World Government: opencon.html.

Leo Szilard is a link between Wells, the Open Conspiracy, and the Baruch Plan; he was one of its promoters. The following is from <http://www.dannen.com/chronbio.html>:

"1929 ... Met H.G. Wells. ... 1930 ... Attempted to organize an international movement of progressive intellectuals based on H.G. Wells' Open Conspiracy."

The International Socialist faction promotes Political Correctness, the World Court, the Kyoto Protocol, Feminism, and Gay Marriage.

This faction mounted the Bolshevik Revolution, but was overthrown by Stalin, who gave them a dose of their own medicine: stalin.html. It is now also called New Left ("new" meaning anti-Stalinist): new-left.html, and Marxist Anti-Communist: kostel.html.

The Soviet Union fell because Gorbachev belongs to the International Socialist faction; he was undoing Stalin's conquests, and trying to form a Single World Civilization. This was impeded because during his rule the US & Britain were in Tory hands (Reagan, Thatcher, Bush snr).

The International Socialist faction opposed the earlier May-Johnson Bill, which belongs to the Tory faction; it was replaced by the McMahon bill.

In the International Socialists' book *ONE WORLD or NONE*, one contributor, Harold C. Urey, wrote, "Here was a bill **originating in the War Department ... The May-Johnson Bill was actually similar** in intent and effect **to the transfer of power from the German Reichstag to Hitler ...**"

This even though the same "Nazi" leadership of the US Army had just defeated Hitler.

More from Urey, and other leaders of the International Socialist faction, at one-world-or-none.html.

The following is from Manhattan Project Chronology: <http://www.atomicarchive.com/History/mp/chronology.shtml>.

{quote} October 3, 1945 **Truman advocates passage of the May-Johnson bill**

December 20, 1945 Senator **Brien McMahon introduces a substitute to the May-Johnson bill**, which had been losing support, including Truman's.

January 1946 Hearings on the McMahon bill begin.

June 14, 1946 **Bernard Baruch presents the American plan** for international control of atomic research.

July 1, 1946 Operation Crossroads begins with Shot Able, a plutonium bomb dropped from a B-29, at Bikini Atoll.

July 15, 1946 Operation Crossroads continues with Shot Baker, a plutonium bomb detonated underwater, at Bikini Atoll.

August 1, 1946 President **Truman signs the Atomic Energy Act of 1946, a slightly amended version of the**

McMahon bill.

December 1946 - January 1947 **The Soviet Union opposes the Baruch Plan**, rendering it useless.

{endquote}

(2) The Baruch Plan - from *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*

A proposal for World Government is a serious matter, affecting everyone. World Government will be final: there will be no "trial run", and nowhere to escape should it turn bad. Examination is therefore warranted; to promote study of this matter, **here are images of the pages of *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*:**

After the letters "bas", the date of each issue is indicated in the format yymmdd, and the page number follows. **All issues are in 1946; at the time, only America had the bomb.**

February 1, p. 6 - Emery Reeves for World Government: [bas460201-p6.jpg](#).

February 15, p.4 - H. C. Urey for World Government: [bas460215-p4.jpg](#).

March 1, back page - about a book called "One World Or None" - authors include **Bohr, Oppenheimer, Szilard** - and LOOK magazine issues a gory, scary pictorial: [bas460301-back-page.jpg](#).

The One World Or None report is at [one-world-or-none.html](#).

June 1, p.1 - Robert Oppenheimer for the Baruch Plan: [bas460601-p1.jpg](#).

A report on the front page (p. 1) of the July 1, 1946 issue reads, 'In the first meeting, on June 13, the program for world-wide control of atomic energy through an International Atomic Development Authority (which was received with widespread approval as a bold and constructive plan even it was first suggested in the Acheson-Lilienthal report) and of its enforcement by the **elimination of veto power**, was presented to the world by **Bernard Baruch** as the **official proposal of the American government**. ... [but] opposed by Gromyko on behalf of the USSR, and has since been criticised in the Russian press as an attempt to establish an American "atomic world domination".'

July 1, p.1 - **"Mr Baruch ... proposed ... the power of veto be eliminated", i.e. in the Security Council:** [bas460701-p1.jpg](#).

July 1, p.3 - Bernard Baruch on the American Proposal: [bas460701-p3.jpg](#).

July 1, p. 8 - Andrej Gromyko puts the Russian Proposal: [bas460701-p8.jpg](#).

An article in the September 1, 1946 issue, written by William T. R. Fox, is headed **"Debate on World Government or Discussion of Atomic Energy Control"**. It begins, "The Lilienthal report of March 16 and the Baruch proposals of June 14 have succeeded in evoking support from an extraordinary broad spectrum of American opinion. Opponents and proponents of world government ... **the great debate on world government** ...".

September 1, p. 22 - William Fox "Debate on World Government or Discussion of Atomic Energy Control": [bas460901-p22.jpg](#).

In the issue of October 1, 1946, Bertrand Russell wrote (p. 21 of that issue):

"The American and British governments ... should make it clear that genuine international cooperation is what

they most desire. But although peace should be their goal, they should not let it appear that they are for peace at any price. At a certain stage, when **their plan** [sic] **for an international government** are ripe, they should offer them to the world ... If Russia acquiesced willingly, all would be well. If not, it would be necessary to bring pressure to bear, even to the extent of risking war ..."

and earlier (p. 19) in the same article:

"When I speak of an international government, I mean one that really governs, not an amiable facade like the League of Nations or a pretentious sham like the United Nations under its present constitution. An international government ... must have the only atomic bombs, the only plant for producing them, the only air force, the only battleships, and, generally, whatever is necessary to make it irresistible."

October 1, p. 1 - Note Russell's article is listed here: [bas461001-p1.jpg](#).

October 1, p. 19 - first page of Russell's article: [bas461001-p19.jpg](#).

October 1, p. 20 - second page of Russell's article: [bas461001-p20.jpg](#).

October 1, p. 21 - third page of Russell's article: [bas461001-p21.jpg](#).

October 1, p. 26 - Gregory Bateson presents Nationalism as the dangerous alternative: [bas461001-p26.jpg](#).

October 1, p. 27 - Bateson continues: a world authority must be a World Government: [bas461001-p27.jpg](#).

October 1, p. 30 - Chester Barnard: Security Through the Sacrifice of Sovereignty: [bas461001-p30.jpg](#).

October 1, p. 32 - back page - note the description of David Lilienthal, and the expression "Publications of the Baruch Office": [bas461001-p32.jpg](#).

November 1, p. 23 - Stalin's reply - but he was not about to concede control: [bas461101-p23.jpg](#).

You can look these pages up in Google Books: <http://books.google.com.au/>. 1946 issues were in Volume 2. Go into the Advanced Search and specify the Publication Year "to" 1946. You might also experiment searching for (eg) "Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, 2 (October 1, 1946)", but Google Books doesn't seem to pick that up.

You can locate the above issues by searching Google (or Google Books) on a string of text from one of the articles.

For example, if you search Google (or Google Books) on "When I speak of an international government" (Bertrand Russell's words above), you'll reach the October 1, 1946 issue. Once you're in one of the 1946 issues, search on other text-strings to reach other issues.

(3) Anglo-American support for the Baruch Plan - Bertrand Russell, H. G. Wells, Arnold Toynbee

(3.1) Bertrand Russell on the Baruch Plan

In 1946, just after the last world war, there were two huge armies, the Soviet and American. If they had joined up, no other force could have resisted them.

Such a proposal for World Government was put in the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* over several

months in 1946. In his book *Has Man a Future?*, Bertrand Russell - an advocate of world government - describes how it developed, **first as a proposal assembled by David Lilienthal, then in a form developed by Bernard Baruch (p. 25 & p. 97).**

This "Baruch Plan" was canvassed in the issues of 1946 and put to Stalin. **By the end of that year, Stalin had rejected it**, on the grounds that it required submission to Washington, **and the Cold War had begun.**

On October 1, 1946, the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists carried an article by Russell entitled The Atomic Bomb and the Prevention of War, **where he writes,**

"The American and British governments ... should make it clear that genuine international cooperation is what they most desire. But although peace should be their goal, they should not let it appear that they are for peace at any price. At a certain stage, when their plan (sic) for an international government are ripe, they should offer them to the world ... If Russia acquiesced willingly, all would be well. If not, it would be necessary to bring pressure to bear, even to the extent of risking war".

(3.2) H. G. Wells on how Russia might be incorporated into a World Government

H.G. Wells laid out the scenario for drawing the USSR back into his vision of a World State, in his book *The Shape of Things to Come* (he called his One-World movement The Modern State Movement).

H. G. Wells, *The Shape of Things to Come: the Ultimate Revolution.* London, Hutchinson & Co., 1933:

{p. 320} **The method of treaty-making** {i.e. international agreements} and a modus vivendi **was already in operation in regard to Russia. There indeed it was hard to say whether the Communist party or the Modern State Movement was in control**, so far had assimilation gone. And the new spirit in the old United States was now so 'Modern' that the protests of Washington and of various state governors against the Controls were received hilariously. Aeroplanes from Dearborn circled over the capital and White House and dropped parodies of the President's instructions to dissolve the Air and Food Trust of America. All over that realist continent, indeed, the Controls expanded as a self-owned business with a complete disregard of political formalities. But the European situation was more perplexing. {end}. hgwells.html.

(3.3) Lionel Curtis on how World Government can be made to look like something else

from Lionel Curtis, *Civitas Dei: THE COMMONWEALTH OF GOD*, MACMILLAN AND CO., LONDON 1938.

{p. 471} **THE GRAND ALLIANCE** {1815, after the defeat of Napoleon}

AT Vienna the concert of Europe had come into being. When the Congress closed **the dominant figure** in its counsels **was the Tzar**, whose position in some ways resembled that which President Wilson afterwards filled at the Conference of Paris. **Like Wilson he dreamed of creating a body to order the general affairs of mankind.** In September 1815 he **invited the governments of Europe to recognise that all human authority is derived from God, and to join in 'a Holy Alliance'** to assert that principle. ...

Alexander hoped through this Article **to realise the** {p. 472} **dreams of a world-government** foreshadowed in the Holy Alliance, and Castlereagh must have accepted it only to avoid giving him offence.

{end} curtis2.html.

Note that Alexander's text **did not explicitly** canvas world government, but the meaning was clear to Curtis; in the same way, the League of Nations and the Baruch Plan disguised their intentions.

(3.4) Arnold J. Toynbee on the Baruch Plan

Arnold J. Toynbee, *One World and India*, Indian Council for Cultural Relations (Orient Longmans), Calcutta 1960.

{p. 1} I am speaking, as you will realise, of **the movement, now astir in all mankind, to live together**, for the first time in human history, as a single family. This enterprise is as ambitious as it is imperative. To carry it to success, many contributions will be needed - contributions of different kinds from different quarters. One can see, for instance, what some of the West's contributions will have been. **The West will have provided the coming world-community with the technological framework** without which it would be impossible to establish and maintain a community on this unprecedentedly large scale. ...

{p. 5} The reason why we need unity so urgently now is both sensational and commonplace. It has been put curtly in the epigram '**One world or none**'. It is obvious to every politically conscious man and woman in the world today that, in the Atomic Age, **if we do not now abolish war, war is going to abolish us**. ...

{p. 6} Abolishing war would involve setting up at least **a rudimentary world-government. The first world-authority** that it would

{p. 7} be necessary for us to establish - and, of course, also to endow with effective power - **would be a central agency for controlling the production and the use of atomic energy**. ... {end} toynbee.html.

(4) Jewish support for the Baruch Plan

Baruch and Lilienthal, the authors of the Plan, were Jews, and both editors of *The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, which carried the Plan and its debate, were Jews.

(4.1) Alfred M. Lilienthal on Bernard Baruch

from **Alfred M. Lilienthal**, *THE ZIONIST CONNECTION II: What Price Peace?*, Veritas Publishing Company, Bullsbrook, Western Australia, 6084, 1983

{p. 235} The Jewish connection on the political level has been of even far greater consequence. Starting at least with the Franklin D. Roosevelt administration, important decision-making echelons of the U.S. government have been filled with many Jews. The New Dealers contained the broadest kind of list, ranging from Henry Morgenthau, Jr., Herbert Lehman, David Niles, and Samuel Rosenberg to Morris Ernst and Robert Nathan. **Bernard Baruch** played a unique role as **adviser to five Presidents**. **David E. Lilienthal** and Lewis H. Strauss were **Chairmen of the Atomic Energy Commission**. {end}

(4.2) Ben-Ami Shillony on Jewish involvement

from **Ben-Ami Shillony**, *The Jews and the Japanese*, Charles E. Tuttle Company, Rutland Vermont, 1991.

{p. 190} **Jewish scientists played a prominent role in the development of the atomic bomb**. It was an Austrian Jewish woman physicist, Lise

{p. 191} Meitner, who first alerted allied scientists to the possibility of splitting the atom. ... In July 1939, **two Hungarian Jewish physicists** who had fled from the Nazis, **Leo Szilard** and Eugene Wigner, informed Albert Einstein, by then a refugee from the Nazis in the United States, that recent German successes in harnessing atomic energy could enable the Nazis to build an atomic bomb. They begged Einstein to urge the U. S. government to develop such a weapon before the Nazis did. ... The man who arranged the meetings between the scientists and the president was a Jewish banker and close friend of the president, Alexander

Sachs. ...

Many Jewish scientists worked on the Manhattan project. The most famous of them was Robert Oppenheimer, director of the Los Alamos laboratory; the **others included Leo Szilard, Niels Bohr**, Otto Frisch, **Eugene Rabinowitch**, James Franck, Felix Bloch, and Edward Teller (who later developed the H-bomb).

{p. 192} **The super weapon that Einstein and the other Jewish scientists had in mind was intended for use against Nazi Germany, not against Japan.** ... after the surrender of Germany in May, 1945, Leo Szilard drafted a petition to President Truman, stating that although there had been justification for using the atomic bomb against Germany, there was no

{p. 193} justification for using it against Japan. ... In early June 1945, James Franck, **Leo Szilard, Eugene Rabinowitch and others dispatched a report to Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson, urging him not to drop the bomb on Japan.** {end}

(4.3) The Atomic Scientists of Chicago

From <http://www.lib.uchicago.edu/e/spcl/chain.html>:

... The Chain Reaction: December 2, 1942 and After

An Exhibition in the Department of Special Collections, University of Chicago Library October 1, 1992 - December 4, 1992

... This exhibition was organized to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of the world's first controlled, self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction, an achievement of Enrico Fermi and his colleagues at the Metallurgical Laboratory at the University of Chicago. ...

1. The Chain Reaction

The University of Chicago is not only the site of the world's first self-sustaining nuclear reaction, but also one of the earliest and most influential centers of the atomic scientists' movement.

On December 2, 1942, **scientists at the University of Chicago produced the world's first self-sustaining nuclear chain reaction** ... This experiment, crucial to the control of nuclear fission, was one of several research projects at sites around the country, each concentrating on some task critical to production of an atomic bomb. All were administered by the U.S. Army under the code name of Manhattan Engineer District, or Manhattan Project. ...

2. The Atomic Scientists of Chicago

... Chicago scientists were particularly concerned about federal legislation, especially in regard to secrecy and military control in atomic research. **Leo Szilard**, who had come to Chicago from Columbia University in 1942, and who was **an active member of the Franck Committee**, outlined in early September a "platform for conversations" with members of Congress, signalling the key role which Chicago scientists were to play in **congressional lobbying**. By September 14, a Planning Committee was circulating a "Statement of Intent" for the association that was to organize itself officially a few days later as the Atomic Scientists of Chicago.

The May-Johnson Bill, introduced in Congress in early October, called for stringent security restrictions, **failed to provide for the sharing of information with foreign countries** {meaning the USSR?}, and **granted a dominant role to the military**, which **galvanized scientists throughout the country**. Fledgling organizations at several research sites began issuing press releases, writing to the War Department, and wiring

members of Congress to point out the bill's shortcomings. John A. Simpson, chair of the executive committee of the Atomic Scientists of Chicago, joined William Higinbotham of the Los Alamos group in coordinating the Washington effort, notifying local organizations of critical turns of events, and attempting to channel the energies of eager scientists who appeared in the capital to volunteer. ...

3. The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists

Perhaps the most concrete demonstration of the commitment of the Chicago scientists to educate themselves and others, and the most enduring symbol of the scientists' movement as a whole, was the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. This publication was reputedly conceived in the unlikely setting of the Stineway Drug Store on 57th Street just east of the University of Chicago campus, where **Eugene Rabinowitch, Hy Goldsmith, and** social scientist **Edward Shils** met to drink coffee, discuss means of weighing issues, and share opinions in the atomic policy debate. On the basis of a proposal from Rabinowitch and Goldsmith, the Atomic Scientists of Chicago executive committee on November 24, 1945, authorized a newsletter with weekly committee reports, items from other site newsletters, and responsible statements as well as "terrible stuff" from the public press.

Goldsmith and Rabinowitch guided the enterprise, which had an almost immediate impact far beyond the Chicago area. Goldsmith, a physicist, had wide contacts outside the scientific community, something that set the Bulletin of Atomic Scientists apart from other site newsletters; and Rabinowitch, a Russian-born biophysicist who had collaborated with James Franck at Goettingen in the early 1930s, was talented writer with a deep and longstanding concern about the bomb's practical and social implications. He had played a key role in formulating the Franck Committee report and in the organization of the ASC.

The first issue of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists of Chicago appeared on December 10, 1945. ...

{end}

(4.4) Rabinowitch and Goldsmith

Two Jewish scientists, Eugene Rabinowitch and Hyman H. Goldsmith, created the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists: <http://www.bullatomsci.org/>.

Rabinowitch's biography is at <http://library.albany.edu/speccoll/findaids/ger075.htm>. It reads:

{quote} Eugene I. Rabinowitch was born on April 27, 1901 at St. Petersburg, ... attended the University of Berlin ... With the rise of the Nazi Party in the early 1930s, Jews, such as Rabinowitch, were expelled from their university posts. ... Rabinowitch ... went first to Copenhagen to work with Neils Bohr at the Institute of Theoretical Physics. ...

In June 1945 Rabinowitch and physicist Leo Szilard authored a memorandum, which became known as **the Franck Report**. The memorandum, which argued against the military use of the atomic bomb ... the Franck Report is one of the earliest statements of the Concerned Scientists Movement of the 1940s and 1950s. ... Rabinowitch was an early leader in both the Movement and the educational effort, **co-founding with Hyman Goldsmith the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists***. As the **editor-in-chief for more than twenty years** Rabinowitch maintained the Bulletin's quality and independence as a forum for discussion of scientific issues with social and political implications. ...

Rabinowitch's interest in public policy and political affairs was demonstrated in 1955, when he **helped to organize** the international forum, which became known as **the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs**.

Eugene I. Rabinowitch Papers

... Series 2: BULLETIN OF THE ATOMIC SCIENTISTS, 1945-1972 The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists (BAS) was begun in December 1945 by Eugene Rabinowitch and Hyman H. Goldsmith. **Originally called the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists of Chicago**, it served as a newsletter for the Atomic Scientists of Chicago. In 1946 the name was changed to its present form. The Bulletin started "as a means of calling public attention to the perils of atomic energy and the urgent need for its control by a civilian agency."

{endquote}

(4.5) Edward Shils

In memoriam: Edward Shils, 1910-1995 by H. R. Trevor-Roper

<http://www.newcriterion.com/archive/14/oct95/shils.htm>

{quote} Perhaps, in the end, this cosmopolitan American-Russian Jew had become something like an English Whig of the best period, before the rot had set in. He believed in liberty and reason sustained by an organic, coherent, but plural society. He opposed all forms of absolutism, intellectual or political, standing equally firm against Communism and McCarthyism; and if these robust beliefs did not always recommend him in the postwar academic world with its labile extremism, what of that? As a professional sociologist, his reputation was secure, and he was in demand.

In the early postwar years, Shils combined his professorship at Chicago with a readership at the London School of Economics. {endquote}

(4.6) The Baruch Plan was certainly supported by Oppenheimer, and seemingly by Bohr. Was Oppenheimer on BOTH sides of the fence? Such scientists saw themselves as **working, not for America or Russia, but for a World Authority based on universalist principles, which transcended national loyalty**. If they were somewhat blind to Jewish domination in creating the USSR ([ginsberg.html](#)), or harshness in running the Cheka, this is comparable to white Americans' blindness to their invasion of indigenous Americans, despite the United States' universal principles.

The sense seems to be that, from the Jewish point of view, both East and West had "Jewish" and "Christian" factions. If "Jewish" factions got power in both the East and West blocks at the same time, they might form a World Government. That's why, whatever Stalin's sins, one might be thankful that he, not Trotsky, was in power. The struggle between the two factions within the USSR led to Stalin's murder in 1953, and arguably to the fall of the Soviet Union: [death-of-stalin.html](#).

Probably Oppenheimer & Bohr saw the "Christians" (i.e. anti-communists) as their main enemy; sharing secrets with Stalin was a way of working against them. After WWII was over, they did not need Stalin so much, and could dare to assert supremacy, in the hope that he might agree, & their long-cherished dream come about.

(4.7) **The very people who created the atomic bomb were the ones telling us we needed World Government because of the danger**. Some of them had even shared the bomb with the Soviet Union, inadvertently creating the arms race.

They were right in a way - competition could destroy the planet; but had World Government been granted on their terms, they and their allies would have been in a position of great power, able to dominate the world. Can they therefore claim altruism as their motive?

Was the Baruch Plan an offer by those who had the bomb to relinquish control of it? Or were they trying to use their monopoly to extend their hegemony over the whole world?

A key feature of the Baruch Plan discussions was an **insistence that the Permanent Members of the Security Council give up their Veto power**; such a demand is still made today by the One-World lobby, as then associated with high finance. Then Baruch, today Soros.

Gorbachev bought their "One World" line; but look what they did to the Soviet Union: [soros.html](#). When they threatened to intervene in Chechnya as they had in Kosovo, Yeltsin reminded them that Russia still had a full nuclear arsenal. Perhaps that's why the American government wants its "missile-defence" system: so that it can intervene anywhere at will ... in the name of "Human Rights".

The West's betrayal of Russia after the Cold War shows that it cannot be trusted.

(5) Major Jordan, Atomic Shipments to USSR, Baruch Plan, & Convergence to World Government- a discussion with Phil Eversoul

(5.1) Date: Sun, 22 Feb 2004 18:16:46 -0800 From: Phil Eversoul <Philev@e-znet.com>

Re: your article in Rense:

Zionist Plans For World Government - 1946 / 2-22-4 and the Baruch Plan.

Have you read the book by Major George Racy Jordan that shows that in 1943-44 Roosevelt shipped all the atomic bomb plans and all the materials used in the Manhattan Project to Stalin via Siberia? This was under the charge of Harry Hopkins. Major Jordan kept a copy of the invoices and shipping records. Solid evidence.

If you have read it, what do you think of it?

REPLY (Peter M):

Phil,

Yes, I have it somewhere. {see <http://www.sweetliberty.org/issues/wars/jordan/01.html>}

I can't recall the details, e.g. whether it says Roosevelt knew about it, or to what extent Hopkins knew the details.

Jordan's allegations relate to the period when World War II was still raging. Defeating Nazi Germany was seen as the top priority, and the USSR treated as a full ally, especially as it was doing most of the fighting.

There was no perception, at the time, that the Cold War would soon break out.

When it did, it was at the urging not only of the Far Right, who had opposed the USSR all along as the greatest danger, but also of the Neo-Cons of the time, who had been Trotskyists, such as James Burnham. I would also place Arthur Koestler in the Trotskyist camp, because he combined moderate Zionism with Communism. A number of such Marxist Anti-Communists joined the CIA at the forefront of the Cold War, as Frances Stonor Saunders shows in her book *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War*: [cia-infiltrating-left.html](#).

If you consider the Baruch Plan of 1946, here you find many of those who helped the USSR get nuclear weapons supporting a plan to "internationalize" the bomb, i.e. place it in the hands of a "World Government" body.

Bertrand Russell even said that the West should threaten war if the USSR did not comply.

It is arguable that the international body would have been under US control. Yet, many of those backing the proposal, in the "advertisement" that appeared in the Bulletin of the Scientists, were scientists who helped the USSR get the bomb.

The "advertisement" - March 1, 1946, back page - is about **a book called "One World Or None"**. Authors include Bohr, Oppenheimer, Szilard, Einstein, & Walter Lippmann: [bas460301-back-page.jpg](#).

The One World Or None report is at [one-world-or-none.html](#).

Pavel Sudoplatov, head of Stalin's spies, is a good source on the Atomic Spies: [atomic-spies.html](#).

(5.2) Date: Sun, 22 Feb 2004 18:22:59 -0800 From: Phil Eversoul <Philev@e-znet.com>

As a follow-up to the note I just sent you about Major Jordan, it strikes me that Stalin's rejection of the Baruch Plan was probably the major cause of the Cold War and the major reason that Stalin and communism suddenly and inexplicably became "bad" after years of the most favorable publicity under Roosevelt.

This would then explain a pro-capitalist, pro-West Trotskyist revival among Jewish Marxists. I wonder if it's too far-fetched to call the Cold War "Trotsky's revenge".

REPLY (Peter M):

Phil,

Those scientists I mentioned preferred Stalin to Hitler, but probably had preferred Trotsky (then dead, of course) to Stalin.

Their motive seems not to have been pro-American; for example, Ilya Ehrenberg wrote that Einstein lambasted the US for its treatment of blacks: [einstein.html](#).

Nor were they pro-Stalin, except in so far as he was the defeater of Hitler.

So they belong to the Convergence camp.

Stalin refused Convergence, but Gorbachev was all for it: [convergence.html](#).

Wilson's 14 Points were also a Convergence program; it gave thoughtful Germans the idea of a different goal to fight for: World Unity. But after surrendering in 1918, the Germans found that they'd been betrayed, just as the Russians found after 1991.

Kennedy put a Convergence program to Khrushchev too: disarmament down to the police level.

Yet Kennedy was later assassinated. Perhaps that is evidence of two competing internationalisms - the Rhodes-CFR-moderate Zionist one (which promoted the Peace Plan in the Middle East) and the expansionist Zionist one.

This can be seen as a struggle over whether the centre of power will be Washington or Jerusalem.

Similarly, there was a struggle between Moscow and Jerusalem as rival centres of socialism; this is the context of the murder of Stalin: [death-of-stalin.html](#).

George Soros - representing the moderate faction - recently upset the Jewish Funders Network - the pro-Sharon faction - with his remarks that Sharon's policies were the cause of increased "Anti-Semitism": <http://www.jfunders.org/news/news.htm>.

(5.3) Date: Tue, 24 Feb 2004 18:14:48 -0800 From: Phil Eversoul <Philev@e-znet.com>

> Yes, I have it somewhere. [referring to George Racy Jordan's expose of Roosevelt's shipments of all the secrets and blueprints of the Manhattan Project to Stalin in 1943-44 via Siberia].

Good. A key book.

> I can't recall the details, e.g. whether it says Roosevelt knew about it, or to what extent Hopkins knew the details.

Hopkins was in charge of this mission. There is no reason to think he did not do it at Roosevelt's behest. But there is no explicit evidence of this, because there was no way for Jordan to know about the intrigues in Washington.

> Jordan's allegations relate to the period when World War II was still raging. Defeating Nazi Germany was seen as the top priority, and the USSR treated as a full ally, especially as it was doing most of the fighting.

True, but there was no way to tell the American people that our top secret atomic technology was going to be sent to the Soviet Union. What this moves also clearly says is that the USA and the USSR were going to merge their political systems -- otherwise, you do not give away your most essential and powerful technology. This is what the Reece Commission found out a few years later (about 1954, I think) in its investigation of American foundations, you may recall. The goal of the top American foundations, like the Ford Foundation, was to assist this merger of the Soviet and American systems.

> There was no perception, at the time, that the Cold War would soon break out.

Yes, exactly. Stalin was "good." Suddenly he became "bad." That is what I call the mystery of the Cold War. However, your explanation of the Baruch Plan's rejection by Stalin goes a long way towards explaining the mystery.

> When it did, it was at the urging not only of the Far Right,

Whoa there. What you are calling the "Far Right" was simply the American Right that had always existed -- the people who were anti-United Nations, anti-interventionist, anti- big government, and believers in America First, meaning simply enlightened national self-interest. Once the Republicans of the East Coast redefined themselves as internationalists and pro-United Nations after WWII, the original American Right was scorned (on the East Coast, anyway) as "paleoconservative." From East Coast Republican internationalist to pro-Israel "neoconservative" was a small jump, assisted by such as William Buckley. The original American Right was left in the dust, to be championed later, although in a compromised way, by such as Barry Goldwater and Ronald Reagan.

> who had opposed the USSR all along as the greatest danger,

Yes, but remember also that the Old Right (as I would prefer to call them) had lost national political power with the ascension of Roosevelt, and they never regained it in the post-war years. The East Coast "liberal and moderate" Right saw to that. The Old Right, therefore, never had the political power to declare and launch the Cold War, although they certainly supported it.

This was part of the mystery of the Cold War: the Old Right, those who truly detested communism, never had the political power to make post-war anti-communist policy. And in fact, the post-war American anti-communist policy was quite insincere and fake, for under this policy, the communist world continued to make immense gains, especially in China as well as Eastern Europe. The communist conquest of China would have been impossible without the assistance of American (and British) policy, for it was based on the

abandoning of Chiang Kai-Shek. And the communist conquest of Eastern Europe meant the abandoning of Poland, for whose sake, supposedly, the West declared war on Germany. Later, there was the anti-communist Hungarian revolution, which the West betrayed.

I believe that the war in Viet Nam was also set up to be a failure for the West and a victory for the communists. As Roosevelt said, "If something happens in politics, you can bet it was planned that way." The immense failure of the West in Viet Nam was too big not to be part of a deliberate plan, and this plan was consistent with the way the entire Cold War was handled: the West loses ground, the communists gain ground. Almost every time. Therefore, the West must merge with communism. Result: tyrannical world government.

Since communism had always received its primary funding, capital, and technology from the West (as we saw with Sutton), there was no way for communism to achieve all those Cold War victories without Western betrayal. That is what is the most sickening part of it, not the losses themselves.

For the most part, the Cold War was a series of successes by the communists and failures by the West. This was no accident. It was planned that way to try to make the West accede to a "compromise" and eventual merger with communism, thereby achieving the World Government that was the holy grail.

> but also of the Neo-Cons of the time, who had been Trotskyists, such as James Burnham. I would also place Arthur Koestler in the Trotskyist camp, because he combined moderate Zionism with Communism. A number of such Marxist Anti-Communists joined the CIA at the forefront of the Cold War, as Frances Stonor Saunders shows in her book *Who Paid the Piper? The CIA and the Cultural Cold War*.

Yes. The driving forces of the Cold War, from the Western side, were the anti-Stalinist forces, which were far more extensive than merely the Old Right, which was out of power and on the decline. You might call it the Marxist, socialist, liberal establishment neo-conservative "Right," as contrasted with any pro-Stalinist forces. But again, this opposition to Stalinism, as it expressed itself in America, was (except for the Old Right) insincere and wishy-washy.

It is a fact that Joseph McCarthy showed (and he has been vindicated by the Venona revelations) that there was a strong pro-Stalinist communist underground in America. The Rosenberg spy case was evidence of this. The pro-Stalinist espionage and propaganda movements in America were protected by the highest levels of the American East Coast Establishment, and this is the real reason McCarthy had to be demonized and destroyed, not because he was on a "witchhunt" or because he was some sort of fascist demagogue. It was the Eisenhower Administration, acting on behalf of the East Coast Establishment, that was determined to destroy McCarthy, for McCarthy was on the verge of showing that the super-rich Eastern capitalists -- the Lodges, the Bundies, the Rockefellers -- were in fact supporters of communism. That was McCarthy's true "sin." In America of the 1950s, such a revelation would have been earth-shattering. In our day, with the disappearance of mainstream American opposition to communism and socialism such as was prevalent in the 1950s, and the current acceptance of cultural Marxism, nobody bats an eye at capitalist-communist cooperation, as in China. Times have changed.

My own take on this is that, whereas the American-Soviet cooperation had to be largely secret, in order not to offend American mainstream opinion, the American-Chinese cooperation is openly admitted. Even the massacres at Tien-Amin Square made hardly a dent. George Bush, Sr saw to that. Too much trade was at stake.

> If you consider the Baruch Plan of 1946, here you find many of those who helped the USSR get nuclear weapons supporting a plan to "internationalize" the bomb, i.e. place it in the hands of a "World Government" body.

Yes. That was indeed the plan, the way to establish the World Government. Nuclear fear. Surrender your freedom or risk nuclear war. Better red than dead, said Bertrand Russell. It was nuclear intimidation to make us surrender all our rights and freedoms. Again, the communists would have had no nuclear weapons at all, but for the West. That was the plan.

> Bertrand Russell even said that the West should threaten war if the USSR did not comply.

I didn't know that, but it makes sense, for that would have meant that Stalin was messing up the plan. Maybe we should all thank Stalin for preserving our freedom from tyrannical world government, at least for a while longer.

> It is arguable that the international body would have been under US control.

No, I don't think so, at least not more than 50-50. The communists were given huge enticements and powers to make them join. For example, in the Korean War, one of the communist functionaries at the UN knew all of the military plans of the United States, by the way the UN was designed --the Korean War was a UN operation -- and he relayed those plans to Stalin and Mao. MacArthur had to be pretty good to fight off the Chinese, the North Koreans, and the UN back-stabbers. (And by the way, MacArthur didn't trust Eisenhower in Korea, thought he was a poor general, and sent him away). Ultimately, Truman had to fire MacArthur to prevent him from achieving victory, in defiance of policy. Defeats of communism were not part of the plan.

> Yet, many of those backing the proposal, in the "advertisement" that appeared in the Bulletin of the Scientists, were scientists who helped the USSR get the bomb.

Why, what a coincidence.

> The "advertisement" - March 1, 1946, back page - is about a book called "One World Or None". Authors include Bohr, Oppenheimer, Szilard, Einstein, & Walter Lippmann:

Yes, nuclear intimidation to make us "merge" with communism. Urged upon us from within. The betrayal of civilization is always from within. It's not the external enemy. It's the fact that our own supposed leaders are working hand in glove with the enemy. And we don't know it, because of media control.

REPLY (Peter M):

James Burnham wrote, in his book *The Struggle For the World*, published in 1947, that the Third World War (the Cold War) began in April 1944, when communist Greek sailors unsuccessfully mounted a minor mutiny. Another incident was the struggle between Mao and Chiang Kai-Chek, which resumed just after the Red Army evicted the Kwantung Army from Manchuria in the space of 2 weeks. A third was the Soviet Union's settling up of a "little red army" in Iran.

Burnham's argument is that these three events happened while the USSR & the West were still allied in World War II. Since they fly in the face of that alliance, Burnham argues that they are part of the Cold War.

I think that he is back-dating things somewhat.

With regards to the Greek sailors, Burnham attributes their rebellion to Comintern headquarters in the Soviet Union. This is drawing a long bow; Stalin & co. would have been too much absorbed by winning World War II, to bother stirring up rebellion in the West at that time.

As for Mao's conflict with Chiang, China's civil war had been going on for years; it was suspended during the Japanese occupation, but its resumption was not part of the Cold War. If it was, then the Cold War began much earlier, when China's civil war began.

If Burnham had really believed, in April 1944, that the Third World War had broken out, he would have written his book then. Instead, it was written & published in 1947; which makes sense if we date the start of the Cold War to 1946.

The Cold War can hardly be dated to before the Baruch Plan, since that Plan was for an alliance - a World Government - which would not make sense if the two were already enemies.

However, the publication of Bertrand Russell's threatening article shows that the alliance must have been at the point of breaking: [bas461001-p21.jpg](#).

Ilya Ehrenburg wrote, "In 1946 the cold war was gaining ground fast ... "(*Postwar Years 1945-1954*, tr. TATIANA SHIBUNINA in collaboration with YVONNE KAPP, LONDON, MACGIBBON & KEE, 1966, p. 60.)

Pavel Sudoplatov wrote in *Special Tasks : The Memoirs Of An Unwanted Witness - A Soviet Spymaster* (Little, Brown and Company, London, 1995 paperback edition):

{p. 172} The most vital information for developing the first Soviet atomic bomb came from scientists engaged in the Manhattan Project to build the American atomic bomb - Robert Oppenheimer, Enrico Fermi, and Leo Szilard.

{p. 207} Bohr had sent official confirmation to the Soviet Embassy that he would meet with a delegation and now he realized that the delegation contained both a scientist and an intelligence officer.

... Bohr readily explained to Terletsky the problems Fermi had at the University of Chicago putting the first nuclear reactor into operation, and he made valuable suggestions that enabled us to overcome our failures. Bohr pointed to a place on a drawing Terletsky showed him and said, "That's the trouble spot." This meeting was essential to starting the Soviet reactor, and we accomplished that feat in December 1946. (See Appendix Seven.)

... After our reactor was put into operation in 1946, Beria issued orders to stop all contacts with our American sources in the Manhattan Project; the FBI was getting close to uncovering some of our agents. Beria said we should think how to use Oppenheimer, Fermi, Szilard,

{p. 208} and others around them in the peace campaign against nuclear armament. Disarmament and the inability to impose nuclear blackmail would deprive the United States of its advantage. We began a worldwide political campaign against nuclear superiority, which kept up until we exploded our own nuclear bomb, in 1949.

{p. 221} The conventional wisdom is that the Cold War started with Winston Churchill's "iron curtain" speech in Fulton, Missouri, on March 6, 1946, but for us, confrontation with the Western allies had begun when the Red Army liberated Eastern Europe. The conflict of interest was evident. The principle agreed upon with Roosevelt at Yalta, providing for multiparty elections, was acceptable to us only for the transition period after the defeat of Germany, while the fate of Eastern Europe was in the balance.

{endquote} [sudoplat.html](#).

Bohr was one of the scientists promoting the Baruch Plan.

In their book *One World Or None* (1946), about half the authors are Jewish: Bohr, Oppenheimer, Szilard, Einstein, Harold Urey and Walter Lippmann: [one-world-or-none.html](#).

Lippmann's was the biggest article. Of him, Carroll Quigley wrote in *Tragedy and Hope: A History of the*

World in Our Time (Macmillan, New York, 1966):

{p. 939} This new recruit, Walter Lippmann, has been, from 1914 to the present, the authentic spokesman in American journalism for the Establishments on both sides of the Atlantic in international affairs. His biweekly columns, which appear in hundreds of American papers, are copyrighted by the New York Herald Tribune which is now owned by J. H. Whitney. It was these connections, as a link between Wall Street and the Round Table Group, which gave Lippmann the opportunity in 1918, while still in his twenties, to be the official interpreter of the meaning of Woodrow Wilson's Fourteen Points to the British government." {endquote}

Quigley also has considerable material on the origin of the *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, and on the 1946 Baruch Plan (as a supporter): [tragedy.html](http://www.jbuff.com/c122100.htm).

The Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists was edited by Eugene Rabinowitch and H. H. Goldsmith. Both appear to be Jewish.

Gerhard Falk wrote at <http://www.jbuff.com/c122100.htm>.

{quote} Commentary by Dr. Gerhard Falk

The Achievements of the American Jewish Community: Four Fruits of Freedom

... A fourth area which owes a great deal to Jewish enterprise in America is our scientific development. Included are, of course, **the great Albert Einstein** who was voted Man of the Century at the beginning of this year. His achievements in physics and the achievements of **Neils Bohr**, Edwin Teller, Leo Szilard, James Franck, **Eugene Rabinowitch**, **Hy Goldsmith**, Hans Bethe, **Harold Urey** and **J. Robert Oppenheimer**, administrator of the atomic bomb project, make it possible to say that the atomic bomb was a Jewish invention and that **the atomic age was introduced to the world by Jews**. What is true of this country is also true of Russia. **The Russian atomic bomb and the hydrogen bomb were also invented by Jewish physicists.** {endquote}

James Burnham broke with Trotsky in 1939/40 and became a leading Anti-Communist. Trotsky's book *In Defence of Marxism* is a refutation of Burnham and the other rebels in his Fourth International; published in 1942, it must be about the last book Trotsky wrote. I have a copy.

In 1941, Burnham wrote *The Managerial Revolution*: [burnham.html](http://www.burnham.html).

(4.4) Date: Sat, 28 Feb 2004 15:52:32 +0500 From: "Eric Walberg" <eric@albatros.uz>

Phil Eversoul <Philev@e-znet.com> wrote:

> Stalin's rejection of the Baruch Plan was probably the major cause of the Cold War and the major reason that Stalin and communism suddenly and inexplicably became "bad" after years of the most favorable publicity under Roosevelt

On face value, yes, but UK/ US (just as with Hussein in Iraq) never had any intention of coopeating with the SU after the defeat of Hitler. Churchill was a rabid anti-communist and said he would make a pact with the devil himself to defeat Hitler. The game the UK/ US played with Hussein (a confirmed Stalinist) was almost identical - sanctions, 'fly-overs', subversion, coddling of dissidents... The only difference is that they could actually invade Iraq without setting off a world war, so they finally did.

Peter M wrote:

> There was no perception, at the time, that the Cold War would soon break out.

Not true! The plans to dump the alliance were just waiting for the end of the war. There's lots of anecdotal evidence by memoirists that I've read - people who became enthusiastic supporters of 'detente' during the war and were shocked when they heard cynical views about how this was only temporary. I don't have urls but I remember reading them back in the '80s.

re convergence, there was no possibility of convergence with Stalin given the extensive overt use of terror and the US imperial hubris, but there certainly was under Khushchev, and Kennedy soon realized it was the best alternative for peaceful development of both sides, but he was quickly assassinated.

This makes me think that the ongoing conspiracy (zio/ capitalist - whatever) was not interested in the reformed neoStalinist SU OR the Kennedy-run US. Kennedy was not actively part of the conspiracy, just as Kh wasn't. Kennedy was the last US prez to fight the zios, and he suffered for it. We must be careful not to take the conspiracy argument to the nth degree just because it looks elegant. History and politics are inherently messy and confusing.

Peter M wrote:

> two competing internationalisms - the Rhodes-CFR-moderate Zionist one (which promoted the Peace Plan in the Middle East) and the expansionist Zionist one.

I don't know what "Rhodes-CFR-moderate Zionist one (which promoted the Peace Plan in the Middle East)" means. Can you explain?

{See, for example, Barry Chamish on the CFR or "British" conspiracy. The CFR took the unusual step of publishing a book against Jewish Fundamentalism, by Ian S.Lustick: <http://www.sas.upenn.edu/pennncip/lustick/>}

I think the planned Kennedy-Khushchev detente would have been a third 'internationalism'. Any ideas? How about a Washington-Moscow center CONTROLLING the zios? It might have been possible before '67. The wild zio euphoria and the radical shift of US Jews to reactionary support of Greater Israel really only began after that.

Phil continues (& remainder are from Phil):

> The original American Right was left in the dust, to be championed later, although in a compromised way, by such as Barry Goldwater and Ronald Reagan.

PLEASE - Reagan was THE original neocon! Goldwater was a rw libertarian - a blue-blooded conservative.

> the post-war American anti-communist policy was quite insincere and fake, for under this policy, the communist world continued to make immense gains, especially in China as well as Eastern Europe.

Eastern Europe?? You mean immediately after the war. But this Soviet occupation did not take root and it was only a matter of time before it collapsed. I'm sure the CIA was smart enough at least to see THAT. It simply was not worth risking a nuclear war to 'liberate' EEurope when it would come of its own accord soon enough.

As for China, the US-China rapprochement was only possible because of Mao's rabid anti-SU grudge. To call China under Tsao Ping and today 'communist' is nonsense. It is simply a capitalist dictatorship.

>I believe that the war in Viet Nam was also set up to be a failure for the West and a victory for the communists.

Is nothing sacred?! You take conspiracy to the n+1 th degree. It loses its meaning.

The tyrannical world government doesn't need such a huge conspiracy to come about. It is the logical result of capitalism gobbling everything up. Don't throw the SU/ Vietnam attempts to thwart capitalism/ imperialism out with the bathwater.

> there was a strong pro-Stalinist communist underground in America

A nice fantasy. It was a handful of mostly idealistic Jews whose first loyalty was to the communist rev, and only secondarily to the creation of a (communist) Israel.

> McCarthy was on the verge of showing that the super-rich Eastern capitalists -- the Lodges, the Bundies, the Rockefellers -- were in fact supporters of communism

Hmmm. The info was always there. If granddaddy Bush's enthusiastic support of Hitler right through the war could be kept under wraps, surely this collusion in building the SU (to make profit, just as Bush wanted to do cooperating with the nazis, without being a true-blue nazi) could be kept from the public. The media has always been the tool of the corporate rich.

> Stalin was messing up the plan. Maybe we should all thank Stalin for preserving our freedom from tyrannical world government, at least for a while longer.

Exactly.

> Truman had to fire MacArthur to prevent him from achieving victory, in defiance of policy

Truman had to fire MacArthur because he f*&^d up royally and almost got the 'UN' force wiped out by going too far and provoking the Chinese.

TOO much conspiracy!! There is conspiracy, but if you go this far, the real conspiracy gets drowned out.

> The betrayal of civilization is always from within. It's not the external enemy. It's the fact that our own supposed leaders are working hand in glove with the enemy.

The betrayal of civilization is always from within. It's not the external enemy. YES. But it's not "our own supposed leaders are working hand in glove with the enemy", unless you mean the 'enemy' to be capitalism!

{end of discussion}

(6) Lord Victor Rothschild's involvement with the Peace Movement and Israel's Nuclear Bomb

Roland Perry, *The Fifth Man* (Pan Books, London, 1994):

{p. xxi} **The Fifth Man was Nathaniel Mayer Victor Rothschild (1910 to 1990), better known as the third Lord Rothschild. He was the British head of the famous banking dynasty ...**

{p. 221} **Months after Israel was formed, Rothschild was involved with Chaim Weizmann in setting up a special nuclear physics department**

{p. 222} in a scientific institute in Rehovoth. The establishment was named after Weizmann, the nation's first president and himself a distinguished biochemist.

Its aim even in those heady days of 1948 was to build nuclear weapons for Israel. It became the nation's best kept secret and the most fervent desire of the new nation's founders. They never wanted their race to be threatened with another Holocaust. **Atomic weapons would be the ultimate deterrent to future Hitlers.**

Yet when the idea for an Israeli bomb was first conceived, the Soviet Union was still a year away from its own first trial blast. The Russians were expecting to detonate, literally after seven years hard labour, when it should have taken perhaps a century of normal research. They had thrown enormous resources, thousands of scientists and strong spy networks at the problem. Israel would have to copy that approach from a standing start. It had limited resources and a trickle of Jewish technicians. But it did have espionage networks.

The dream of an Israeli bomb was ambitious indeed, but it **spurred Rothschild to keep abreast of all things nuclear so he could pass on data to the Weizmann Institute**, which was planning a **nuclear reactor at Dimona in the Negev Desert.** **Under a modified guise of concern about the spread and dangers of nuclear weapons, he was able to keep contact with appropriate scientists around the world.** He began this official and legitimate process at the end of the Second World War by **becoming an expert on fallout**, which **allowed him to monitor the Manhattan project.** He continued in the 1950s, even on occasions attending informal conferences on controlling nuclear weapons held by leading British atomic scientists, who were beginning to comprehend and assess their creation.

The Dane, **Niels Bohr**, had stimulated consciences post-war by **arguing that nuclear matters belonged to an 'open world', with which the Russians - desperate to build a nuclear arsenal - agreed wholeheartedly.** **He had plenty of support from the scientific community in the US too, but Washington was never going to support 'the free interchange of ideas'** with those dangerous Russians, even if it had nothing to do with detail about bomb technology.

Bohr's idea was taken up by mathematician and philosopher, Bertrand Russell, Albert Einstein and the British Atomic Scientists

{p. 223} **Association, many of whose members Rothschild knew well. They set up their first conference at Pugwash, Nova Scotia, in 1955.**

Rothschild assiduously kept contact with the key organizers so that his involvement always seemed natural.

Correspondence with Russell in early 1955 was typical:

Dear Russell, I would like to present the manuscript of your recent broadcast dealing with the Hydrogen Bomb to Trinity. Can you suggest any way in which I might acquire it? Yours Sincerely, Rothschild

The so-called Pugwash Conferences emerged as the scientists' response to the arms race between the US, USSR, China, Britain and France, and the dangers of fallout.

Scientists from twenty-two nations turned up and problems concerned with peace and the impact of atomic weapons on humankind were discussed. **Rothschild later floated ideas about how to harness the nuclear genie for 'peaceful purposes'** and not war. **He urged the idea of breeder reactors for energy**, of which he was a long-term supporter. **What he avoided mentioning was the ease with which breeder reactors could be adapted to extract weapons-grade nuclear fuel.**

Everything he learnt ended up at the Weizmann Institute, which was in part his creation. (His secret support of it with information and finance was rewarded publicly **in 1962 when he was made an Honorary Fellow of the Institute.**)

Rothschild was not a technician like Klaus Fuchs. He could not create the weaponry for Israel. But he could

inform its Intelligence leaders (with whom he was very close as an important, secret member of Mossad) which scientists might be helpful, where the available technology might be and how it might be obtained and funded.

The Israelis sounded out several possibilities. In 1956, Shimon Peres, then director of the Defence Ministry under Moshe Dayan, had many meetings with ministers in Guy Mollet's French socialist government as they prepared for the Suez Canal operation. The French, British and Israelis planned to wrest back the Canal from President Nasser of Egypt, who had nationalized it.

{p. 224} Peres first gained the trust of the French, then he struck a deal with Defence Minister, Bourges Maunoury. **In return for Israel's help over the Suez Canal**, in which it would make the initial attack on Egyptian defences, **the French promised to consider supplying nuclear plants at Dimona**. Israel carried out its part at Suez, and fortuitously Maunoury replaced Mollet as prime minister. **Maunoury and his foreign minister signed a top-secret agreement with Peres and Asher Ben-Natan, a Mossad agent at Israel's Defence Ministry.**

In it, **the French promised to supply a powerful 24-megawatt reactor**, the technical know-how to run it, and some uranium. **The secret deal was only known to about a dozen individuals, including Rothschild**, and with good reason. **The fine print of the document allowed for the inclusion of equipment which would permit the Israelis to produce weapons-grade nuclear fuel.**

In 1957, French engineers began building **the two-storey reactor facility at Dimona** on the edge of the Negev Desert, which **secretly went down six levels below ground**. The subterranean construction would be the place where nuclear weapons would be built. With several Mossad officers in attendance, the engineers also dug an 80-foot deep crater in the sand. In it they buried Machon 2 - a unit which would allow the Israelis to extract weapons grade plutonium, the fuel for the bomb. ...

{end}

Leo Szilard and H.G. Wells, founders of the Green Left. Leo Szilard helped create the first nuclear chain reaction, and initiated the letter to Roosevelt that got the Manhattan Project under way. Later, he warned of the dangers of nuclear weapons, and joined Wells' crusade for World Government: [szilard.html](#).

Pavel Sudoplatov, Stalin's spymaster, says in his memoirs *Special Tasks*, that Niels Bohr & Robert Oppenheimer helped the Soviet Union get the atomic bomb.

Sudoplatov knew nothing of the Baruch Plan for World Government of 1946; but he reveals that several of the International Scientists promoting it had passed on atomic secrets to Soviet Russia.

He writes, "Since Oppenheimer, Bohr, and Fermi were fierce opponents of violence, they would seek to prevent a nuclear war, creating a balance of power through sharing the secrets of atomic energy.": [atomic-spies.html](#).

When Mordecai Vanunu revealed Israel's nuclear weapons, Shimon Peres ordered Mossad to arrest him: [vanunu.html](#); he was jailed for 18 years.

More on Rothschild at [perry.html](#).

Harry Hopkins, Roosevelt's top negotiator with Stalin, was a Soviet spy. KGB defectors Oleg Gordievsky and Vasili Mitrokhin both said so (see their books *KGB* and *The Sword and the Shield*, respectively). *Major Jordan's Diaries* provides detailed evidence of Hopkins' role in the transfer of Atomic technology to the USSR: [atomic-spies.html](#).

Making sense of Stalin's rejection of the Baruch Plan: [stalin.html](#).

Back to the One World index: [oneworld.html](#).

Write to me at [contact.html](#).

[HOME](#)